DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 375 CS 502 296

AUTHOR Cragan, John F.; Wright, David W.
TITLE Small Group Communication Research of the 1970's: A Synthesis and Critique.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (64th, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 2-5, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Discussion (Teaching Technique); *Group Dynamics; Higher Education; *Interaction Process Analysis; Leadership; Literature Reviews; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; *Speech Communication; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

One hundred studies on small group communication that were published in speech communication journals from 1969 to 1978 are summarized and critiqued in this paper. The literature is classified into three new lines of research (critical variable, process, and tangential) and three continuing lines of research (leadership, discussion, and pedagogy). Finally, the paper presents seven recommendations for ways to improve the quality of small group communication: (1) the replication of major small group communication studies needs to be encouraged, (2) research should focus on the clarification of operational definitions of the unit of communication used in studying small group communication interaction, (3) a weighted, parsimonious list of communication behaviors occurring in small groups needs to be generated, (4) small group phasic research should work toward generalization, (5) a clear relationship should exist between the findings of small group research and the training imparted in textbooks and classrooms, (6) small group research efforts in speech communication should be conducted by a greater number of scholars, and (7) extraordinary cooperation efforts may be required to produce rapid advancement in small group communication research. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED162375

SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION RESEARCH OF THE 1970's:

A SYNTHESIS AND CRITIQUE

by

John F. Cragan and David W. Wright

Illinois State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John F. Cragan

David W. Wright

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the annual convention of the

Speech Communication Association
Minneapolis, Minnesota
November 3, 1978

CS 502 296

SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION RESEARCH OF THE 1970'S: A SYNTHESIS AND CRITIQUE

John F. Cragan and David W. Wright

ABSTRACT

This essay summarizes and critiques the one hundred studies on small group communication that have been published in speech communication journals from 1969 to 1978. The small group literature is classified into three new lines of research which focus on the communication variables of small group processes and three continuing lines of research, namely, leadership, discussion, and pedagogy. The studies are analyzed in light of the criticism spawned by Becker's 1970 call for a re-examination of small group research. Finally, seven recommendations are set forth that suggest ways of improving the quality of small group communication research.

John F. Cragan and David W. Wright are Associate Professors of Speech Communication in the Department of Information Sciences, Illinois State University.

SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION RESEARCH OF THE 1970'S

A SYNTHESIS AND CRITIQUE

John F. Cragan and David W. Wright
Illinois State University

In 1970, Samuel L. Becker, as editor of Speech Monographs, called into question the fruitfulness of our research on group processes.[1] He stated that it was his conviction that our discipline should be making rapid advances in the area of small group communication. Thus, in a precedent setting act, Becker called upon two of his associate editors to assess the status of small group research in speech communication. Ernest G. Bormann and Dennis S. Gouran responded to his call in a now-famous exchange.[2] In the space of a year, five more speech communication scholars sensed and expressed Becker's concern for the quality of small group research.[3]

The purpose of this essay is threefold: (1) to summarize speech communication scholars' major concerns in previous research; (2) to categorize, critique, and synthesize the small group research of the 1970's; and (3) to make research recommendations for our discipline's continued study of small group communication.

The Call for Research

Historically, our discipline has felt that discussion methods should serve as the focal point for our study of small group behavior.[4] The dialogue that took place in our journals in 1970 and 1971 clearly reflects a call for an expanded and redefined claim of our discipline to the study of group processes. Mortensen forcibly argued that the parameters for

our discipline's study of groups should be through the establishment of a communication theory of group behavior and that we should prioritize our work by focusing on communication variables.[5] Fisher reinforced Mortensen's call for a communication theory of group behavior and, in addition, argued that the "task" group should be the object of our study.[6]

Although most critics agreed upon the need for the study of communication variables in on-going groups, there emerged only two attempts at establishing a framework for building a theory of small groups.[7] Fisher and Hawes responded to the call for a process theory by acknowledging McGrath and Altman's observation that previous attempts at theorizing about groups by social scientists was done from a logico-deductive approach.[8] Consequently, they recommended an analytical approach which involved the process of generating theory from the data. Analoging from general systems theory, Fisher and Hawes detail an approach for building group theory which culminated in their Interact System Model.[9] Gouran did not offer a model for building a process group theory but instead provided an outline that categorized the variables most important in evolving a theory of decision-making group communication. The three-part schema is composed of: (1) group outcome variables, (2) communication behaviors, and (3) the context of communication.[10]

Attempts at theory-building at the turn of the decade may have appeared premature to many speech communication scholars since problems of research design occupied much of our attention. In fact, the thrust of the Bormann-Gouran interchange of 1970 centered on the issue of research design. Bormann stated that the major difficulty of small group research is that it has been conducted in university laboratories using rather simple input-output designs. He stated:

> The fact is, however, that while laboratory studies of small group phenomena tend to be elegant in research design and methodology, sophisticated in statistical treatment, and suitable for publication as a brief research report, they are not very useful in providing knowledge about group process.[11]

In addition, he quarreled with the concepts that were claimed to be operationalized in lab studies; e.g., leadership, authoritarianism, and productivity. And finally, Bormann doubted that the manipulation of a variable in a fifteen-minute test-tube group has any relationship to on-going groups in the real world. Gouran agreed with much of Bormann's criticism; however, he felt there was a place for critical-variable laboratory research if properly designed. Fisher articulated Bormann's implicit suggestions for more fruitful research in small groups when he listed the following six recommendations:

> (1) Research should study groups--not collections of individuals . . . ; (2) Research should utilize a group task--not an individual task . . . ; (3) Research should observe directly the interactive features of group task . . . ; (4) Research should consider elements of time as inherent in small group task performance . . . ; (5) Research should either place greater emphasis on observing established groups in the field or take greater care in forming laboratory groups . . . ; and (6) Research should employ a process research model and reject an input-output model . . . .[12]

In 1973, Gouran provided two additional guidelines for designing research: (1) focus on sequential relationships among units on communication, and

(2) move from bivariate to multivariate designs.[13]

The last area for criticism of small group research that Becker spawned appears to be the problem areas centering around data analysis. Bormann and Gouran agreed that the procedures used prior to 1970 were not the most appropriate. Gouran suspected that " . . . a substantial number of small group researchers (as well as researchers in other behavioral sciences) seem to allow the statistical procedures they employ to dictate their choice of questions rather than allowing their questions to dictate their choice of statistics."[14] Bormann felt that our knowledge of group phenomena was not sufficient to warrant the sophisticated statistical procedures that were being used. In fact, he advocated setting aside "all the trappings of the laboratory and search for knowledge about how groups work."[15] By 1972, Gouran was advocating more sophisticated statistical procedures, such as multivariate analysis, in order to analyze data generated by newly applied designs used by speech communication scholars in their attempts to study groups as a process of many interacting small group variables.[16]

The criticism resulting from Becker's call for a re-examination of our small group research can be summarized in the following manner:

(1) Our discipline's claim to the continuing study of group processes should be broadened to include not only the examination of group methods, but also the initiation of research that would generate a communication theory of small groups, with particular emphasis on the communication process of the task group.

(2) The problems of building a small group communication theory appear to be related to the acknowledged barrenness of previous small group research designs, the low relationship between communication concepts and the operational definitions of them (particularly the definition of a "small group"),

and the inappropriate application of statistical procedures for data analysis in small group studies.

Synthesis of Small Group Research of the 1970's

The last ten years of small group research in speech communication has generated approximately one hundred studies. These studies can be roughly classified into three new lines of research and three continuing lines of research. The new lines are characterized by their focus on communication variables as they relate to group processes. The three traditional lines of research reflect our continued interest in discussion methods, in leadership as a small group variable, and in the teaching of small groups.

New Lines of Research

The 1970's are truly marked by the response to Becker's call for research. As contrasted to the 1960's, the majority of studies of the present decade attempted to identify a number of communication variables. As one might expect, the different conceptualizations of the unit of communication and the number of communication concepts identified by the fifty-six studies that constitute the three new lines of research are quite diverse. Table 1 contains ten category systems of communication concepts. As indicated in Table 1, the literature reveals a wide variety of operational definitions of communication as a concept in small group processes. We have ten different category systems based on eight different definitions of communication. Definitions of a unit of communication have ranged from a single thought through complete individual statements to interaction of statements to multiple interactions of statements (i.e., themes) and even including a complete discussion as a communication unit.

The lists of communication variables represent attempts at describing in a fairly exhaustive sense the communication behavior that occurs in small groups. These lists range from five to eleven communication variables with a good deal of redundancy of some concepts like orientation, tension, and agreement. The rich variance that we see in the basic definition of communication and the specific lists of communication variables can best be understood by first examining the basic rationale of each category. In 1969, Gouran isolated sixteen communication variables derived primarily from his reading of discussion textbooks of the previous thirty years.[18] He developed this list for the purpose of determining what variables were important for achieving a discussion outcome, namely consensus. Later Gouran, et al., developed a system for measuring perceived group quality. Other lists of communication variables were developed by Fisher and Gouran; Baird and Stech; Chesebro, Cragan, and McCullough; and Mabry for discussing group structure or phases of the communication process of a group over time. Leathers, Bodaken, Lashbrook, Champagne, and McCroskey and Wright developed systems in order to create instruments that could be used to measure communication interaction. These instruments are called respectively LFRI, PROANA 5, and IBM.

Insert Table 1

Although the new lines of research in the 1970's have communication variables as their commonality, they are best described by their differences. The first new line of research looks at communication variables and measures their significance in terms of group outputs. The second line of new research looks at communication variables in order to describe the communication process of groups over time. The third new line of research looks at communication

variables in group settings for uses other than building a communication theory of small groups.

Critical Variable Line of Research. The best example of the first new line of research that looks at communication variables in terms of output is the group of studies dealing with orientation and consensus. In his dissertation Gouran found that orientation is related to discussion outcomes. He stated: "The statements of consensus groups will be higher in orientation than the statements of non-consensus groups."[19] This finding spawned a number of subsequent studies. Table 2 displays the definitions of three concepts (small group, orientation, and consensus), including their operationalizations as they were utilized in the six studies done in orientation-consensus research in the last decade.[20]

Insert Table 2

The orientation-consensus research, which is partially reflected in Table 2, is by far the most coherent and consistently investigated relationship in the speech communication small group literature of the last ten years. However, an examination of the Table indicates that even in a narrow and closely-tied line of research, important differences surface that speak to the initial criticism of small group communication research raised by Bormann in 1970. First, the operational definition of the concepts undergo marked change, yet the research reports in our journals do not discuss the rationale for these changes. As Table 2 indicates, Gouran's original research defined consensus as unanimous agreement by discussants on a single policy question yet, thereafter, consensus is operationalized as "distance form," or "levels of agreement" as measured by shift-of-opinion scales, and later a perceived consensus test. We find it remarkable that our journals do not contain a

lengthy discussion dealing with justifications for such definitions.

Second, the building of a list of discreet communication variables that work toward building communication explanations of small group processes is blurred by many choices made in designing orientation-consensus research. As can be seen in Table 2, changes in the conceptual and operational definitions of orientation raise questions about what concept is being studied. Knutson's research on orientation adds to Gouran's description of orientation, the attribute of "lessening tension." As Table 1 indicates, tension has been a separate and important concept in attempts by other speech communication scholars to isolate key communication variables in small group decision-making. Even within the orientation-consensus line of research, we find examples of concept transformations. Kline in 1970 partially defined, in operational terms, opinionatedness statements containing more self-referrent words (I, me, my, mine, myself)[21]; whereas Kline and Hullinger in the 1973 study define these self-referrent words as characteristic of the concept, self-orientation.[22] This sort of slippage in the use of communication concepts works a hardship in our attempts to build a communication based theory of small groups.

Gouran, Brown, and Henry argue that it is useful to know the relative importance of communication variables in small group processes.[23] Certainly, one of the best ways to do this is by measuring these variables against some important dependent variable. Obviously consensus is one of these. However, this first new line of research, while avoiding much of the criticism that was raised at the turn of the decade, still illustrates some of the problems in critical variable research in small group communication.

Process Line of Research. In contrast to the first line of new research, the second line stresses communication variables that describe communication

processes of groups over time. The research of the last decade reveals a tendency for these two lines of research to produce a dichotomy with respect to how a small group is operationally defined in the research. Gouran's research in 1969 reports a definition of a small group that is typical of the first line of research. A year later Fisher was utilizing a different type of group definition which is typical of the second line of new research. This dichotomy of how groups have been operationally defined represents one difference between these two new lines of research. Table 3 displays the 1969 Gouran prototypo and the 1970 Fisher prototype group definitions with their distinguishing characteristics.[24] The Table indicates duration of the discussion and the number of group member characteristics that were controlled for and it points up the major differences between the Type A and Type B operationalizations of a small group. To some degree these differences can be expected inasmuch as a Type A definition helps in controlling for a critical communication variable that is to be measured, while a Type B definition helps insure that there will be varied and rich discussion in studying the interaction of communication variables over time.

Insert Table 3

However, if we push these two definitions too far away from each other, we may run the risk that Darwin Cartwright describes in his examination of 196 "risky-shift" studies.[25] Cartwright concluded: "After ten years of research, Stoner's original problem remains unsolved. We still do not know how the risk-taking behavior of "real-life" groups compares with that of individuals."[26]

Part of the reason for the breakdown of the "risky-shift" research is that the predictive theory developed in the lab didn't work in the field.

If we persist in operationalizing one kind of small group for developing predictive statements in the lab and another kind of definition for describing natural groups, we may find ourselves with two small group communication theories: one that predicts communication behavior of brief zero history groups in the lab and another theory that only provides a post hoc description of the natural behavior of decision-making groups in the field.

What marks this second line of research in the 1970's as new is that new categories of communication varaables were used as the data base for determining the stages or phases of group development. Table 4 contains the five stagic descriptions of the communication process of small groups reported in the 1970's literature.[27] Fisher's research and Mabry's research present four stage models of task groups, with Ellis and Fisher providing the phases of conflict in a task group. Chesebro, Cragan, and McCullough's research produced a four stage description of consciousness-raising groups, while another study by Mabry identified three stages in encounter groups.

In addition to the studies that developed stagic explanations of communication process, based on the interaction of communication variables, this second line of research contained another strain that looked at the distributional and sequential communication structure in small groups. In the tradition of Bales, and using a modified Bales category system, Gouran and Baird in 1972 initiated research to describe distributional and sequential patterns over the time span of problem-solving and informal groups. A number of studies followed that attempt to define certain aspects of the initial study of Gouran and Baird.[28]

Insert Table 4

The rich and meaningful descriptions contained in communication terms of small groups that the research of this decade has produced has been extremely beneficial to our understanding of group processes. However, this second line of new research has some of the weaknesses found in the first line. Table 1 depicts the varied conceptualizations of the basic unit of communication that would be examined in a group discussion in order to actuate the various lists of communication behaviors. With such rich variety, it is difficult to summarize, and in fact even determine, relationships between similar communication variables across communication studies. For example, Mabry looked at "communication themes" while Fisher investigated units of verbal interaction. Fisher used a communication variable called Agreement and Mabry used a communication variable labelled Affectivity (sequence of agreement or disagreement, anger or laughter.[29] So we have two similar looking variables fitted over two different size chunks of group talk producing two different lists (four stagic concepts each) that work towards describing the communcation process of a task group.

In examining eight studies in Speech Monographs for the period 1970-71, Bochner highlighted the problems of reliability and validity with respect to developing operational definitions of communication concepts that can be used to describe communication processes in small groups.[30] Bochner's criticism is easily sustained, primarily because of our failure to either do or publish replications of previous research. Probably the most remarkable observation of the approximately one hundred studies done in small group communication in the last ten years is that not one of these is a replication of a previous study. This omission is compounded by our tendencies to avoid synthesis even where it might be possible. For example, Ellis and Fisher use a communication category system analogous to the category system Fisher used

in his original study. Both studies were on decision-making groups, both studies produced a stagic explanation of group process, yet the Ellis and Fisher report does not attempt to integrate or even explain how their three stages of conflict fit with Fisher's four stages of group development. This seemed an obvious thing to do as Fisher's original second stage was called conflict. The reports of the two studies laid side-by-side does not give enough information for us to ever begin to explain the relationship between the findings of the two studies. Despite the fact that we have various descriptions of the process of groups that are hard to generalize from, we should be pleased with the accomplishments that have been made. Ten years ago, we were subject to the criticism that we had no communication explanation of group processes over time, while today we are fortunate enough to be troubled with the problems of synthesizing a helathy list.

Tangential Line of Research. The third new line of research in small group processes contains eighteen studies that roughly can be classified into two types.[31] The first type of research tends to examine small group processes predominantly from social psychological lenses and thus does not work towards a communication "why" explanation of small groups. Although the research is quite useful from a larger social science perspective, it does not further directly the call set out in 1970 for a communication theory of small group behavior. The second type of research in this third new line treats small groups as merely a setting for testing concepts that would work toward a general communication theory, and thus this research does not speak directly to communication that is unique to the small group process.

Illustrative of the first type on this third new line of research is a study by Bochner and Bochner entitled, "A Multivariate Investigation of Machiavellianism and Task Structure in Four-Man Groups."[32] This research

demonstrated that "Machiavellian profiles had a decided effect on group interaction, particularly task-related communicative acts."[33] This research points to the utility of a psychological concept's ability to predict communication behavior; this sort of research does not build a communication theory that explains group processes but instead builds a psychological theory of group behavior. This type of research reduces communication concepts to a secondary role in small group theory-building.

On the other hand, a number of traditional social psychological concepts have been operationalized in speech communication research as essentially communication concepts. This research has moved toward a communication theory of conflict. Some of the studies of communication conflict have dealt with communication conflict in groups and thus the ultimate utility of the research is not yet clear.[34] This research may build a theory of conflict communication that applies to many settings or the research may form a subset of a communication theory of small group processes.

The second type of investigation in this third new line of research studies communication concepts in group settings that have already been established as integral parts of theories that are not unique to small group processes alone. An example of this type of research is a study of McCroskey, Young, and Scott entitled, "The Effects of Message Sidedness and Evidence on Inoculation Against Counterpersuasion in Small Group Communication."[35] One of the findings was: "Subjects were less influenced by counterpersuasion in a small group communication setting when the initial persuader employed a two-sided, refutational message than when he employed a one-sided message."[36] Although this research is meaningful in terms of building a persuasion theory, obviously the findings are at best tangential to a communication theory of small group processes.

This third new line of research contains many laudable contributions to the speech communication discipline; however, the research taken as a whole does not work directly towards the building of a communication theory of small group processes.

Continuing Lines of Research

The last ten years reflects continuing interest in three well-established lines of research in small group processes: leadership, discussion, and pedagogy. The three continuing lines of research include thirty-three studies which are evenly distributed among the three lines. The leadership and pedagogy lines show signs of being influenced by Becker's call but the discussion line of research does not.

Leadership Line of Research. Traditionally, leadership has been an ongoing interest of speech communication scholars and the last decade supports this trend. Since 1970 there have been thirteen pieces of research related to small group leadership behavior.[37] Gouran's review of leadership approaches serves as a rough framework for classifying the research in this area.[38] Essentially, Gouran reviewed four major approaches to the study of leadership: trait, style, situational, and functional. Further, he suggested that the functional approach would provide the major area of study for future research in small group studies.

Only two studies could be classified as research on the functional approach to leadership.[39] If anything, the last decade reflects a renewed interest in the trait approach to leadership. Traditional trait concepts such as power, authority, extroversion, character attitude, personality, and a special interest on the impact of sex on leaders in small groups have received the bulk of attention.[40] This new trait research differs from some

old approaches in that the traits are not viewed as invariant attributes that distinguish leaders from nonleaders regardless of task and group composition, but instead are viewed in terms of the interaction with various elements of the group situation.

The styles of leadership approach was the second most popular area of leadership study in the 1970's. Like the trait research, the three stylistic studies do not treat the three part division of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles in the traditional manner, but instead emphasize the communication behaviors associated with leader styles.[41] Finally, there were just two studies that could be clearly identified as stressing the situational approach.[42]

Although the leadership line of research since Gouran's 1970 piece contains familiar research strategies and theoretical concepts, the research taken as a whole does reveal a sensitivity to the criticisms that were raised at the beginning of the decade. The research designs are much improved; however, the major change that has occurred is a new emphasis on the communicative behaviors of leaders. To this degree, this continuing line of research works toward building a communication explanation of small groups.

Discussion Line of Research. The second continuing traditional line of research over the past decade includes thirteen studies on discussion.[43] Carl Larson, in his 1971 review of speech communication studies of the 1960's, indicates that the major concentration was on problem solving group thinking patterns.[44] This trend continued, by and large, in the same vein since Larson's report. The discussion line of research does not reflect the call for building a communication theory of small group processes. We continue to maintain a dichotomy between discussion principles and practices and the area of small group communication processes.

Pedagogy Line of Research. The last traditional line of research relates to the teaching of small groups. The ten articles on small group pedagogy contain good advice on the teaching of various concepts and procedures.[45] An excellent example of innovative work on teaching small group communication is Shields and Kidd's, "Teaching Through Popular Film: A Small Group Analysis of The Poseidon Adventure."[46] However, the pedagogical article that relates directly to Becker's call for research is the one by Bormann.[47] Bormann argues that speech communication's legitimate and traditional object of study in the interdisciplinary area of small group processes is the task group. His argument on what we ought to teach is consistent with the decade's concern for communication behaviors of small groups, while at the same time remaining true to our continuing interest in discussion principles.

The one hundred articles that have been published in the last decade are displayed in Table 5. We have classified the research into six lines of research (three new and three old) and list the articles that criticize small group research as a seventh area. Table 5 graphically indicates the impact of Becker's call for research. Fifty-six studies formed new lines of research in small group processes and thirty-eight of these work directly toward building a communication theory to explain and predict small group processes.

Research Recommendations

In examining the small group research of the 1970's, certain obsercations manifest themsleves. This section details the seven general research recommendations that we feel would assist speech communication scholars in doing small group research. These recommendations are made not from the perspective

of an individual piece of research, or even a given line of research, but from the belief that a coordinated effort by the members of our discipline is needed if a communication theory of small group processes is to be advanced. The research recommendations are as follows:

1. The replication of major small group communication studies needs to be strongly encouraged. Of the one hundred articles published in small group communication over the last ten years, not one study was a replication of a previously published piece of research. Since the number of worthy studies currently exceeds the ability of our professional organization to provide space for publication, there is a tendency to give priority to research that contributes "new knowledge." Given this point, a circular argument occurs in that researchers will tend to avoid replications in that high status is not attached to these efforts and they have not been previously recognized in the journals. If we are to change this pattern and begin to conduct and publish replication studies, then more attention needs to be given to the specific aspects of the research needed by scholars who were not initially involved with the original research undertaking so that they can produce replications.

2. Future research should focus on the clarification of operational definitions of the unit of communication that is used in studying the communicative interaction of small groups. Using a wide variety of operational definitions of a communication unit (e.g., idea, statement, theme, whole discussion), we have generated some rather similar looking lists of communication behaviors and some roughly analogous stages in group processes. The lack of precision in what we call one bit of small group communication may account for the differences we find in the lists of communication behaviors we see and the stagic developments of groups. On the other hand, it

may not matter at all how precise or similar we are in our operational definition of communication. By directing our studies to how important a unit of communication is in small group research, we may be able to study group behavior in a more coherent fashion in pursuit of a communication explanation of small groups.

3. A weighted, parsimonious list of communication behaviors that occur in small groups needs to be generated. About seventy-five different communication behaviors in small groups have been isolated as a part of ten different lists. On the surface, it appears there is great redundancy in these lists and a small, useful list could be factored out. Furthermore, we should work on determining the relative importance of these behaviors and how they function in relation to each other in the group process. Therefore, it would probably not be productive for future research to concentrate simply on the generation of more lists of communication behaviors that occur in small groups.

4. Small group phasic research should work toward generalization. Numbers of rich field and lab studies demonstrating the utility of classifying and labeling group communication into stages needs to be conducted. In addition, we need to design research that predicts either successive stages for some useful purpose, or predicts group outcomes based upon stagic development.

5. There should be a clear relationship between the findings of our small group research and the knowledge and training that is imparted in our textbooks and classrooms. The correlation between what we have been researching and what we have been teaching is not high. We tend to teach a lot of prescriptive discussion skills, and yet in the last ten years we have done little research on the appropriateness of these skills. Conversely,

we have concentrated our research efforts on small group behavior, yet many speech communication textbooks on small groups do not reflect this research. In fact, some textbooks tend to focus almost exclusively on theories and findings of other disciplines.

6. Small group research efforts in the field of speech communication should be conducted by a greater number of scholars. Most Ph.D. programs in speech communication offer graduate courses in small group processes. However, the bulk of the research in the last ten years has been shouldered by relatively few scholars and institutions. Given the tremendous amount of work that needs to be done in building viable communication theories of small groups, shouldn't more of us be involved?

7. Extraordinary cooperative efforts may be required to produce rapid advancement in small group communication research. One of the governing principles of our professional organization's holding conventions and funding scholarly journals is to maintain the necessary cooperative dialogue that is required if we are to advance the knowledge of our discipline. Currently the dialogue among small group scholars as it is expressed in journal articles and convention programs has not been sufficient to reach the goals that Becker set forth in his original call for research. This is in part due to the fact that small group communication is not a separate interest group in our national organizations, and in part due to the limited space in our journals. Therefore, it may be necessary for us to go outside the normal structural channels that have been established for small group communication dialogue within the discipline. Vehicles that might facilitate an increase in dialogue are: (1) a special conference, (2) a common resource center, and (3) a newsletter on research notes.

The last ten years have been very productive and exciting ones for small

group communication scholars. The challenge that Becker set forth in 1970 has been taken up and we now have three new lines of research that are responsive to the criticisms made by Bormann, Gouran, Fisher, Mortenson, and Larson. Although much of our research still falls prey to this criticism, we have isolated a number of communication variables which play significant roles in the small group process. We have provided stagic descriptions of groups over time as determined by communication interaction of members. We have focused on the ongoing basic group and contrasted it with other kinds of small groups. Our continuing lines of research in leadership and pedagogy also reflect Becker's call for communication research.

Future research should work towards synthesis and replication through a cooperative dialogue of scholars with focus on the description and prediction of communication behaviors of the small group. Hopefully, the efforts of the next decade will help us in establishing an even firmer based communication theory of small group processes.

Table 1

COMMUNICATION CONCEPTS PRESENT IN SMALL GROUP PROCESSES: CRITICAL VARIABLES

Author	Gouran (1969)	Leathers (1969)	Fisher (1970)
Unit of Communication	Statements	Stimulus Statements & Feedback Responses	Verbal Interaction
Communication Variables	Clarity Opinionatedness Interest Amount of Information Provocativeness Orientation Objectivity Length	Deliberateness Relevance Atomization Fidelity Tension Ideation Flexibility Digression Involvement	Asserted Seeking Interpretation Substantiation Clarification Modification Summary Agreement Favorable Toward Proposal Unfavorable Toward Proposal Ambiguous Toward Proposal

Author	Stech (1970)	McCroskey & Wright (1971)	Bodaken, Lashbrook, Champagne (1971)
Unit of Communication	Utterance	Stimulus Statements & Segments	Message: Patterned & Unpatterned Interaction
Communication Variables	Phatic Procedural Ranking Positive Response Negative Response Justification Personal-Emotional	Orientation Tension Flexibility Relevance Interest Verbosity	Balance of Participation Communication Line Usage Clique Groups Detrimental Clique Groups Communication Propensity Leadership Isolation Dominance

Table 1 (cont.)

Author	Gouran & Baird (1972)	Chesebro, Cragan, McCullough (1973)	Fisher (1970)
Unit of Communication	Statements (Modified Bales)	Themes (Rhetorical Characteristics)	Communication Themes (Parsons PVM)
Communication Variables	Initiation of a Theme Expression of Agreement Expression of Disagreement Gives Information Asks for Information	"I - you - us - we - they" Noncombative vs. Combative Climate: Somber, Warm, Hostile Temporal Aspects: Present, Past, Future Fantasy	Affectivity Diffuseness Particularism Quality Neutrality Specificity Universalism Performance

Author	Gouran, Brown, & Henry (1978)
Unit of Communication	Complete Group Discussion
Communication Variables	Relevance of Issues Handling of Issues Amplifications Goal-Directedness Documentation Examination of Issues Leadership Functions Interpersonal Relations Evenness of Participation

Table 2

ORIENTATION-CONSENSUS RESEARCH:
DEFINITION OF THREE CRITICAL VARIABLES

Research	Definition Of Group	Definition of Orientation	Definition of Consensus
Gouran SM 1969	Number of Groups: 30, finally reduced to 6 for analysis Number of Members: 6 Group Composition: 3 support status quo; 3 hold most liberal alternative Length of Discussion: 30 minutes Task: 3 pre-selected questions of policy	Verbal: "A statement is said to give orientation if it reflects an attempt on the part of its maker to facilitate achievement of a group's goal by using facts, making helpful suggestions, or trying to resolve conflict." p. 388 Operational: A rating on a 1-7 scale of the amount of orientation present in a given statement by a trained judge. p. 389	Verbal and Operational: "Unanimous agreement on a single policy." p. 389
Kline CSSJ 1972	Number of Groups: 8 Number of Members: 6 Group Composition: 3 either High or Low Orientation and 3 Liberal and 3 Conservative Length of Discussion" not reported Task: preselected	Verbal: Uses Gouran's verbal definition of orientation. p. 45 Operational: Subjects rated high in orientation behavior in past discussion in one set of groups, while subjects rated low in orientation behavior in past discussions were placed in other groups. pp. 45-46.	Verbal: "Distance from consensus." p. 46 Operational: "The total number of positions subjects were away from the most agreed upon policy. For example, if subjects who initially selected alternative AAAEEE shifted to BCCCDD respectively, then alternative C would be the most selected policy. Since alternative B is one position from C and since alternative D is two positions from C, this group would have a total distance score of three." p. 46

23

Table 2 (cont.)

Research	Definition of Group	Definition of Orientation	Definition of Consensus
Knutson SM 1972	Number of Groups: 30 Number of Members: 5 Group Composition: 2 members who hold status quo, plus 2 members who hold most liberal alternative, and a confederate. Length of Discussion: 30 minutes Task: preselected questions of policy	Verbal: "Behavior which reflected an attempt on the part of the individual to resolve conflict, facilitate achievement of a group's goal, make helpful suggestions or lessen tension." p. 160 Operational: HIGH ORIENTATION-"A confederate attempts to resolve conflict, make helpful suggestions, reinforce agreement, and encourage participation. NO ORIENTATION CONDITION-"the confederate remains silent unless spoken to directly. In this case, he responded with a noncommittal answer such as 'I don't know." LOW ORIENTATION CONDITION-"The confederate intensifies conflict, withheld information, insisted that no agreement could be reached, and discouraged participation." p. 160	Verbal: "For purpose of this study, the dependent variable was viewed as distance from consensus." p. 160 Operational: "Distance from consensus was determined by the number of positions subjects were away from complete agreement . . . each subject could move four positions along the scale, the grand total of possible movement for all positions for all four subjects was sixteen positions." p. 161

Table 2 (cont.)

Research	Definition Of Group	Definition of Orientation	Definition of Consensus
Kline/ Hullinger SM 1973	Number of Groups: 6 Number of Members: 6 Group Composition: 3 persons most conservative/liberal Length of Discussion: not reported Task: preselected discussion questions	Verbal and Operational: "Hypothesis 2: Statements from groups which reach consensus will show less self orientation than statements from groups which do not reach consensus. More specifically, statements from consensus groups will contain fewer self-referent words (I, me, my, mine, myself), more other-directed words (you, your, you're) and more group words (we, us, ours)." p. 72 Note: In Kline's SM 1970, the operational definition of opinionated statements in part were statements containing "more of the self-reference words me, my, I, mine, and myself." p. 284	Verbal: "Consensus groups were those that were in unanimous or near unanimous agreement. Non-consensers were those who had made little headway toward agreement." p. 73 (Kline and Hullinger do not report the operational procedure they use to assess "near unanimous" or "little headway" consensus groups.)

Table 2 (cont.)

Research	Definition of Group	Definition of Orientation	Definition of Consensus
Knutson/ Holdridge SM 1975	Number of Groups: 26 Number of Members: 5 Group Composition: subjects randomly assigned to each group Length of Discussion: 30 minutes Task: preselected questions of policy	Verbal: "Orientation has been defined as verbal behaviors that reflect attempts on the part of individuals engaged in group discussion to resolve conflict, facilitate achievement of a group's goal, make helpful suggestions, or lessen tension." p. 108 Operational: Same as Gouran's 1969 study (a seven-point scale). p. 111	Verbal: "Level of agreement, but not necessarily satisfaction, reached by group members following the discussion of a question of policy as determined by Perceived Consensus Test." p. 111 Operational: A 6-item Perceived Consensus Test with each item consisting of a 7-point scale. p. 111

Table 3

Sample Size	Type A (Gouran) 30 Groups	Type B (Fisher) 10 Groups
Size of Group	N = 6	N varied from 4-12.
Time/Duration of Discussion	30-45 Minutes	Varied 25 Minutes to 30 Hours.
Characteristics of Group Members	Class student pretested & stratified for attitude toward policy (3 status quo & 3 most liberal). Male/female evenly divided when possible.	Stressed diversity and did not control for sex, age, socio-economic background, occupation. Class and non-class groups.
Group Task (Discussion Topic)	Selected by researchers through pretesting.	Task determined by Natural Group.
Group History Studied	Selected Segments.	Content Analysis of Entire Discussion.
Group Goal	Achieve Consensus.	Achieve Consensus.
Group Setting	Zero History Lab Group.	Zero and On-going Lab and Field Groups

Table 4

STAGES AND PHASES OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT

Fisher (SM 1970)	Chesebro, Cragan & McCullough (SM 1973)
Decision-Making Group	Consciousness-Raising Group
1. Orientation. 2. Conflict. 3. Emergence. 4. Reinforcement.	1. Self-realization of a new identity. 2. Group identity through polarization. 3. New values for the groups. 4. Relating to other revolutionary groups.
Ellis/Fisher (HCR 1975)	**Mabry (HCR 1975)**
Phases of Conflict in a Group	Decision-Making Group
1. Interpersonal. 2. Confrontation. 3. Substantive.	1. Latency. 2. Adaptation. 3. Integration. 4. Goal-Attainment.
Mabry (HCR 1975)	
Encounter Group	
1. Boundary-Seeking. 2. Ambivalence. 3. Actualization.	

Table 5

ARRAY OF SMALL GROUP LINES OF RESEARCH OF THE 1970'S

Becker, SM, 1970
Bormann, SM, 1970
Gouran, SM, 1970
Mortensen, QJS, 1970
Larson, ST, 1971
Fisher, JC, 1971
Fisher & Hawes, QJS, 1971
Gouran, QJS, 1973
Bochner, SM, 1974

II. New Lines of Research

Critical Communication Variable

Gouran, SM, 1969
Kline, SM, 1970
Gouran & Whitehead, CSSJ, 1971
Kline, CSSJ, 1972
Knutson, SM, 1972
Leathers, SM, 1972
Kline & Hullinger, SM, 1973
Knutson & Holdridge, SM, 1975
Hill, CM, 1976
Baird, ST, 1976
Knutson & Kowitz, CSSJ, 1977
Gouran, Brown & Henry, CM, 1978

Process: Communication Phases, Stages, and Instruments

Leathers, QJS, 1969
Fisher, SM, 1970
Fisher, JC, 1970
Stech, SM, 1970
Bostrom, SM, 1970
Leathers, SM, 1970
Bodaken, Lashbrook & Champagne, WS, 1970
Leathers, CSSJ, 1971
McCroskey & WRight, SM, 1971
Gouran & Baird, SM, 1972
Stech & Goldberg, SM, 1972
Rosenfeld & Jensen, WS, 1972
Chesebro, Cragan & McCullough, SM, 1973
Saine & Bock, SSCJ, 1973
Saine & Bock, CSSJ, 1973
Baird, SM, 1974
Valentine & Fisher, SM, 1974
Saine, Schulman & Emerson, SSCJ, 1974
Mabry, SM, 1975
Mabry, HCRa, 1975
Mabry, HCRb, 1975
Ellis & Fisher, HCR, 1975
Lustig & Grove, WS, 1975
Gouran & Geonetta, CSSJ, 1977
Sorensen & McCroskey, CM 1977
Sharf, CM, 1978

Tangential: Non-Small Group Communication Theory Building

Welden, SM, 1969
Myers & Goldberg, JC, 1970
Burgoon, SM, 1971
Harmon, JC, 1971
Cowell, JC, 1972
Ogawa & Welden, JC, 1972
McCroskey, Young & Scott, SM, 9972
Bochner & Bocheer, SM, 1972
Gouran, CSSJ, 1973
Phillpsen & Saine, SM, 1973
Marr, SM, 1974
Bell, SM, 1974
Prentice, SM, 1975
Norton, CM, 1976
Stech, CSSJ, 1977
Burgoon, CSSJ, 1977
Daly, McCroskey & Richmond, WSSJ, 1977
Bradley, CM, 1978

Table 5 (cont.)

III . Continuing Lines of Research

Leadership

Gouran, CSSJ, 1971
Larson, SM, 1971
Sargent & Miller, JC, 1971
Kwal & Fleshler, ST, 1973
Lumsden, CSSJ, 1974
Rosenfeld & Plax, SM, 1975
Yarby, SM, 1975
Lashbrook, HCR, 1975
Rosenfeld & Fowler, CM, 1976
Downs & Pickett, CM, 1977
Baird, SSCJ, 1977
Wood, CM, 1977
Bormann, Pratt & Putnam, CM, 1978

Discussion

Larson, SM, 1969
Larson & Gratz, ST, 1970
Geier, Forston, & Larson, WS, 1970
Smith, SSJ, 1971
Applbaum & Anatol, JC, 1971
Logue, ST, 1973
Nelson, Pettelle, & Monroe, ST, 1974
Jablin, Selbold, & Sorenson, CSSJ, 1977
Mears, JC, 1974
Mabry & Rossiter, WS, 1975
Shuter, TS, 1975
Taylor, CE, 1976

Pedagogy

Bormann, ST, 1970
Pyke & Neely, JC, 1970
Barker & Wahlers, ST, 1970
Rundle, ST, 1971
Shields & Kidd, ST, 1973
Downs, ST, 1974
Runkle, TS, 1974
Johnson & Sharf, CE, 1976
Hazel, CE, 1976
Knutson, Wheeless, & Divers, CE, 1976

Footnotes

[1]Samuel L. Becker, "Editor's Note," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 211.

[2]Ernest G. Bormann, "The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Research," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 211-217; Dennis S. Gouran, "Response to 'The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Research,'" Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 218-218. Dennis S. Gouran expanded on his initial response to Becker's call with much more specificity in his later article, "Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973), 22-29.

[3]See C. David Mortensen, "The Status of Small Group Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (1970), 304-309; and B. Aubrey Fisher, "Communication Research and the Task-Oriented Group," Journal of Communication, 21 (1971), 136-149; and B. Aubrey Fisher and Leonard C. Hawes, "An Interact System Model: Generating a Grounded Theory of Small Groups," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 57 (1971), 444-453. Prior to Becker's call, there have been several assessments of speech communication research related to small group processes. See Milton Dickens and Marguerite Heffernan, "Experimental Research in Group Discussion," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 35 (1949), 23-29; John Keltner, "Communication in Discussion and Group Processes: Some Research Trends of the Decade 1950-59--Part II," Journal of Communication, 11 (1961), 27-33; and Carl E. Larson, "Speech Communication Research on Small Groups," The Speech Teacher, 20 (1971), 89-107; and John E. Baird, Jr., "Sex Differences

in Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research," The Speech Teacher, 25 (1976), 179-192. Other disciplines have synthesized their research of small groups, most notable examples are Barry E. Collins and Harold Guetzkow, A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964); and Clovis R. Sheperd, Small Groups: Some Sociological Perspectives (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964); and Joseph E. McGrath and Irwin Altman, Small Group Research: A Synthesis and Critique of the Field (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966); and Marvin E. Shaw, Group Dynamics: The Psychology of Small Group Behavior, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976).

[4]For example, see James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, The Principles and Methods of Discussion (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939); and Dean C. Bainlund and Franklyn S. Haiman, The Dynamics of Discussion (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960); and Halbert E. Gulley, Discussion, Conference and Group Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960).

[5]Mortensen, pp. 305-306.

[6]Fisher, pp. 138-142. Ernest G. Bormann made a similar argument with regard to the teaching of group processes in his article, "Pedagogic Space: A Strategy for Teaching Discussion," The Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), 272-277. Also see the first edition of Bormann's book, Discussion and Group Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), which reflects the discipline's dual concern at the beginning of this decade with discussion methods and the processes of task groups.

[7]Fisher and Hawes; and Gouran, "Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research."

[8]Fisher and Hawes, p. 444.

[9]Ibid., p. 453.

[10]Gouran, "Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research," pp. 23-28.

[11]Bormann, "The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Research," p. 213.

[12]Fisher, pp. 142-144.

[13]Gouran, "Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research," pp. 28-29.

[14]Gouran, "Response to 'The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Research,'" p. 218.

[15]Bormann, "The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Research," p. 215.

[16]Gouran, "Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research," p. 29.

[17]The first list of communication variables was developed by Dennis G. Gouran and reported in his article, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussion of Questions of Policy," Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 387-391. These eight variables were factored out of an original list of sixteen variables which formed the basis of his dissertation. See Dennis S. Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus Discussions of Questions of Policy," Diss. University of Iowa 1968. The other eight variables are relevance, emotionality, competence, friendliness, cooperativeness, redundancy, agreement, and controversy. Dale G. Leathers constructed the second list which is reported in his article, "Process, Disruption and Measurement in Small Group Communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (1969), 287-300. Leathers has used the instrument derived from his list of communication variables in two other sutdies. See "The Process Effects of Trust-Destroying Behavior in the Small Group," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 180-187; and "The Feedback Rating Instrument: A New Means of Evaluating Discussion," Central States Speech Journal, 22 (1971), 32-42. B. Aubrey Fisher's list of eleven variables

is reported in "Decision Emergence: Phases in Group Decision-Making," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 53-66. His list is based in part on the works of Laura Crowell and Thomas M. Scheidel. See "Categories for Analysis of Idea Development in Discussion Groups," Journal of Social Psychology, 54 (1961), 155-168; and "Idea Development in Small Discussion Groups," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 50 (1964), 140-145. Also see, B. Aubrey Gisher, "The Process of Decision Modification in Small Discussion Groups," Journal of Communication, 20 (1970), 51-54. For a modified application of Fisher's list see Kristin B. Valentine add B. Aubrey Fisher, "An Interaction Analysis of Verbal Innovative Deviance in Small Groups," Speech Monographs, 41 (1974), 413-420; and Donald G. Ellis and B. Aubrey Fisher, "Phases of Conflict in Small Group Development: A Markov Analysis," Human Communication Research, 1 (1975), 195-212. Ernest L. Stech's seven variables are reported in "An Analysis of Interaction Structure in the Discussion of a Ranking Task," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 249-256. For modified application of Stech's list, see Thomas Saine and Douglas G. Bock's two studies, "A Comparison of the Distributional and Sequential Structures of Interaction in High and Low Consensus Groups," Central States Speech Journal, 24 (973), 91-96; and "The Effects of Reward Critieria on the Structure of Interaction in Problem-Solving Groups," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 39 (1973), 55-62. Also see Thomas J. Saine, Linda S. Schulman, and Laura C. Emerson, "The Effects of Group Size on the Structure of Interaction in Problem-Solving Groups," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 29 (1970), 333-345. Edward M. Bodaken, William B. Lashbrook, and Marie Champagne report a fifth list on their article, "PROANA 5: A Computerized Technique for the Analysis of Small Group Interaction," Western Speech, 35 (1971), 112-115. This list was initially developed by Lashbrook; see his monograph, "Proana 5: A Computerized Technique for the

Analysis of Small Group Interaction," SCRL 3-67, Michigan State University, 1967. For an example of a similar sociogram system see Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Paul A. Jensen, "Compatability and Interaction in the Small Group: Validation of Schutz' Firo-B Using a Modified Version of Lashbrook's Proana 5," Western Speech, 36 (1972), 31-40. Also see Robert N. Bostrom, "Patterns of Communicative Interaction in Small Groups," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 257-263. James C. McCroskey and David W. Wright derived a list of six communication dimensions from a factor analysis of thirty original scales, see "The Development of an Instrument for Measuring Interaction Behavior in Small Groups," Speech Monographs, 38 (1971), 335-340. Also see Gail Sorensen and James C. McCroskey, "The Prediction of Interaction Behavior in Small Groups: Zero History vs. Intact Groups," Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 73-80. Dennis S. Gouran and John E. Baird, Jr. based their lists on modified Bales-like statements. See their article, "An Analysis of Distributional and Sequential Structure in Problem-Solving and Informal Group Discussions," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 18-22. For other applications of modified Bales' lists see Ernest L. Stech and Alvin A. Goldberg, "Sampling Discussion Group Interaction," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 312-314; and John E. Baird, Jr., "A Comparison of Distributional and Sequential Structure in Cooperative and Competitive Group Discussion," Speech Monographs, 41 (1974), 226-232; and Dennis S. Gouran and Sam C. Geonetta, "Patterns of Interaction as a Function of the Degree of Leadership Centralized in Decision-Making Groups," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977), 47-53; and Judee K. Burgoon, "Unwillingness to Communicate as a Predictor of Small Group Discussion Behaviors and Evaluations," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977), 122-133. James W. Chesebro, John F. Cragan, and Patricia McCullough's list of rhetorical themes present in consciousness-raising groups is contained in their

article, "The Small Group Technique of the Radical Revolutionary: A Synthetic Study of Consciousness Raising," Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 136-146. For examples of other studies that look at rhetorical aspects of small groups see Catherine R. Cowell, "Group Process as Metaphor," Journal of Communication, 22 (1972), 113-123; and Barbara F. Sharf, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Leadership Emergence in Small Groups," Communication Monographs, 45 (1978), 156-172. Edward A. Mabry's list of eight communication variables of small task groups is reported in two studies. See his "An Instrument for Assessing Content Themes in Group Interaction," Communication Monographs, 42 (1975), 291-297; and "Exploratory Analysis of a Developmental Model for Task-Oriented Small Groups," Human Communication Research, 2 (1975), 66-74. Mabry also used eleven communication variables in studying encounter groups. See "A Sequential Structure of Interaction in Encounter Groups," Human Communication Research, 1 (1975), 302-307. Also see Myron W. Lustig and Theodore G. Grove, "Interaction Analysis of Small Problem-Solving Groups Containing Reticent and Non-Reticent Members," Western Speech, 39 (1975), 155-164. Dennis S. Gouran, Candace Brown, and David R. Henry produced a rank-ordered list of nine conmunication variables that correlate with the quality of a group discussion. See "Behavioral Correlates of Perceptions of Quality in Decision-Making Discussions," Communication Monographs, 45 (1978), 51-63. Also see Dale G. Leathers, "Quality of Group Communication As A Determinant of Group Product," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 166-173.

[18]Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy," Diss., p. 24.

[19]Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy," Speech Monographs, p. 391.

[20]See Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussion

of Questions of Policy;" and Thomas J. Knutson, "Our Experimental Study of the Effects of Orientation Behavior on Small Group Consensus," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 159-165; and John A. Kline, "Orientation and Group Consensus," Central States Speech Journal, 23 (1972), 44-47; and John A. Kline and James L. Hullinger, "Redundancy, Self-Orientation and Group Consensus," Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 72-74; and Thomas J. Knutson and William E. Holdridge, "Orientation Behavior, Leadership and Consensus: A Possible Functional Relationship," Speech Monographs, 42 (1975), 107-114; and Thomas J. Knutson and Albert C. Kowitz, "Effects of Information Type and Level of Orientation on Consensus-Achievement in Substantive and Affective Small-Group Conflict," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977), 54-63. There are other studies that relate to at least one of the three concepts that are included in orientation consensus research. John A. Kline considered procedures for validating Gouran's conceptualization of orientation using original data from Gouran's dissertation; see his article, "Indices of Opinionated and Orientating Statements in Problem-Solving Discussions," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 282-286. Dennis S. Gouran and Jack L. Whitehead used orientation as a variable in a participant-observer rating reliability study; see their article "An Investigation of Ratings of Duscussion Statements by Participants and Observers," Central States Speech Journal, 21 (1971), 263-268. Theodore J. Marr studied orientation and consensus in a specialized conflict situation; see his "Conciliation and Verbal Responses as Functions of Orientation and Threat in Group Interaction," Speech Monographs, 41 (1974), 6-18. Timothy A. Hill used consensus as one of four dependent variables in his study; see his article "An Experimenaal Study of Relationship Between Opinionated Leadership and Small Group Consensus," Speech Monographs, 43 (1976), 246-257.

[21]Kline, "Indices of Opinionated and Orientating Statements in Problem-Solving Discussion," p. 285.

[22]Kline and Hullinger, p. 72.

[23]Gouran, Brown, and Henry, p. 52.

[24]See Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy;" and Fisher, "Decision Emergence: Phases in Group Decision-Making."

[25]"Determinants of Scientific Progress: The Case of Research on the Risky Shift," American Psychologist, 28 (1973), 222-231.

[26]Cartwright, p. 231.

[27]See Fisher, "Decision Emergence: Phases in Group Decision-Making;" and Chesebro, Cragan, and McCullough; and Ellis and Fisher; and Mabry, "Sequential Structure of Interaction in Encounter Groups;" and Mabry; "Exploratory Analysis of a Developmental Model for Task Oriented Small Groups."

[28]Gouran and Baird. Also see Baird; and Saine and Bock, "A Comparison of the Distributional and Sequential Structures of Interaction in High and Low Consensus Groups," and "The Effects of Reward Criteria on the Structure of Interaction in Problem-Solving Groups," and Saine, Schulman, and Emerson.

[29]Mabry, "Exploratory Analysis of a Developmental Model for Task-Oriented Small Groups," p. 70.

[30]Arthur P. Bochner, "Task and Instrumentation Variables as Factors Jeopardizing the Validity of Published Group Communication Research, 1970-71," Speech Monographs, 41 (1974), 169-178.

[31]See Mae Arnold Bell, "The Effects of Substantive and Affective Conflict in Problem-Solving Groups," Speech Monographs, 41 (1974), 19-23; and Arthur P. Bochner and Brenda Bochner, "The Multivariate Investigation of Machiavellianism and Task Structure in Four-Man Groups," Speech Monographs,

39 (1972), 277-285; and Patricia H. Bradley, "Power, Status, and Upward Communication in Small Decision-Making Groups," Communication Monographs, 45 (1978), 33-43; and J. Burgoon and Michael Burgoon, "Amount of Conflicting Information in a Group Discussion and Tolerance for Ambiguity as Predictors of Task Attractiveness," Speech Monographs, 38 (1971), 121-124; and John A. Daly, James C. McCroskey, and Virginia P. Richmond, "Relationsips Between Vocal Activity and Perceptions of Communicators in Small Group Interaction," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 41 (1977), 175-187; and Dennis S. Gouran, "Correlates of Member Satisfaction in Group Decision-Making Discussions," Central States Speech Journal, 24 (1973), 91-96; and Shirley J. Harmon, "Crisis: Group Response to Emergency," Journal of Communication, 21 (1971), 266-272; and James C. McCroskey, Thomas J. Young, and Michael D. Scott, "The Effects of Message Sidedness and Evidence on Inoculation Against Counterpersuasion in Small Group Communication," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 205-212; and Michele Tolela Myers and Alvin A. Goldberg, "Group Credibility and Opinion Change," Journal of Communication, 20 (1970), 174-179; and Robert Norton, "Manifestations of Ambiguity Tolerance Through Verbal Behavior in Small Groups," Communication Monographs, 43 (1976), 35-43; and Dennis M. Ogowa and Terry A. Weldon, "Cross-Cultural Analysis of Feedback Behavior Within Japanese American and Caucasion American Small Groups," Journal of Communication, 22 (1972), 189-195; and Gerry F. Philpsen and Thomas J. Saine, "The Effect of Reward Criteria on Verbal Participation in Group Discussion," Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 151-153; and Daniel S. Prentice, "The Effect of Trust-Destroying Communication on Verbal Fluency in the Small Group," Speech Monographs, 42 (1975), 262-270; and Ernest L. Stech, "The Effect of Category System Design on Estimates of Sequential and Distributional Structure," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977), 64-69; and Terry A.

Weldon, "Small Group Application of Q-Technique," Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 68-72.

[32]Bochner and Bochner.

[33]Ibid., p. 284.

[34]See Bell; and Marr.

[35]McCroskey, et al.

[36]Ibid., p. 211.

[37]See John E. Baird, Jr., "Some Nonverbal Elements of Leadership Emergence," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 42 (1977), 352-361; and Ernest G. Borman, Jerie Pratt, and Linda Putnam, "Power Authority and Sex: Male Response to Female Leadership," Communication Monographs, 45 (1978), 119-155; and Cal W. Downs and Terry Pickett, "An Analysis of the Effect of Nine Leadership Group Compatibility Contingencies Upon Productivity and Member Satisfaction," Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 220-230; and Dennis S. Gouran, "Conceptual and Methodological Approaches to the Study of Leadership," Central States Speech Journal, 21 (1970), 217-223; and Teri Kival and Helen Fleshler, "The Influence of Self-Esteem on Emergent Leadership Patterns," The Speech Teacher, 22 (1973), 100-106; and Charles U. Larons, "The Verbal Response of Groups to the Absence or Presence of Leadership," Speech Monographs, 38 (1971), 177-181; and Velma J. Lashbrook, "Leadership Emergence and Source Valence: Concepts in Support of Interaction Theory and Measurement," Human Communication Research, 1 (1975), 308-315; and Gay Lumsden, "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Verbal Agreement on Leadership Maintenance in Problem-Solving Discussion," Central States Speech Journal, 25 (1974), 270-276; and Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Gene D. Fowler, "Personality, Sex and Leadership Style," Communication Monographs, 43 (1976), 320-324; and Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Timothy G. Plax, "Personality Determinants of Autocratic and

Democratic Leadership," Speech Monographs, 42 (1975), 203-208; and James F. Sargent and Gerald R. Miller, "Some Difference in Certain Communication Behavior of Autocratic and Democratic Group Leaders," Journal of Communication, 21 (1971), 233-252; and Julia T. Wood, "Leading in Purposive Discussions: A Study of Adaptive Behavior," Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 152-165; and Janet Yerby, "Attitude, Task and Sex Composition as Variables Affecting Female Leadership in Small Group Problem-Solving Groups," Speech Monographs, 42 (1975), 160-168.

[38]Gouran, "Conceptual and Methodological Approaches to the Study of Leadership."

[39]Kwal and Fleshler; also see Knutson and Holdridge.

[40]See Bormann, et al.; and Kwal and Fleshler; and Lashbrook; and Rosenfeld and Fowler; and Rosenfeld and Plax; and Yerby.

[41]See Larson; Lumsden; and Sargent and Miller. Gouran and Geonetta's study also could be considered a stylistic approach to leadership.

[42]See Downs and Pickett; and Wood. Sharf's work also could be considered a situational approach.

[43]See Ronald L. Applbaum and Karl Anatol, "PERT: A Tool for Communication Research Planning," Journal of Communication, 21 (1971), 368-380; and John G. Geier, Robert F. Forston and Charles Urban Larson, "Small Group Discussion Versus the Lecture Method: A Study in Individual Decision-Making," Western Speech, 34 (1970), 38-45; and Kim Giffin and Kendall Bradley, "Group Counseling for Speech Anxiety: An Approach and a Rationale," Journal of Communication, 19 (1969), 22-29; and Fredric Jablin, David R. Seibold, and Ritch L. Sorenson, "Potential Inhibitory Effects of Group Participation on Brainstorming Performance," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977), 113-121; and Carl E. Larson, "Forms of Analysis and Small Group Problem-Solving,"

Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 452-455; and Carl E. Larson and Robert D. Gratz, "Problem-Solving Discussion Training and T-Group Training: An Experimental Comparison," The Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), 54-57; and Cal M. Logue, "Persuasion as an Aspect of Problem Solving," The Speech Teacher, 22 (1973), 81-82; Edward A. Mabry and Charles M. Rossiter, Jr., "Laboratory Training and Problem-Solving Groups: Distinctions and Relationships," Western Speech, 39 (1975), 102-111; and Peter Mears, "Structuring Communication in a Working Group," Journal of Communication, 24 (1974), 71-79; and William Nelson, John L. Petelle, and Craig Monroe, "A Revised Strategy for Idea Generation in Small Group Decision-Making," The Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 191-196; and Robert Shuter, "The Alternative Institution: A Small Group Study of Environmental Influence on Sex-Role Interaction Style," Today's Speech, 23 (1975), 45-50; and William S. Smith, "The Contribution of Discussion to the Development of Clinical Method," Southern Speech Journal, 36 (1971), 267-274; and Brenda Taylor, "Utilizing the Forensic Team for Study in Small Group Processes," Communication Education, 24 (1976), 71-73.

[44]Larson, "Speech Communication Research on Small Groups," pp. 91-95.

[45]See Larry L. Barker and Kathy J. Wahlers, "A Project to Teach Characteristics and Capabilities of Small Groups," The Speech Teacher, 20 (1971), 287-288; and Ernest G. Bormann, "Pedagogic Space: A Strategy for Teaching Discussion," The Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), 272-277; and Cal W. Downs, "The Impact of Laboratory Training on Leadership Orientation, Values and Self-Image," The Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 197-205; and Harry Hazel, Jr., "Group Problem Solving and the Historical Example," Communication Education, 25 (1976), 79-81; and Fern Johnson and Barbara Sharf, "Teaching Conference Methods in a Group Discussion Course," Communication Education, 25 (1976), 74-75; and Thomas J. Knutson, Lawrence R. Wheeless, and Larry Divers,

"Developing Teachable Small Group Communication Behaviors," Communication Education, 26 (1977), 333-337; and Sandra W. Pyke and Cathie O. Neely, "Evaluation of a Group Training Program," Journal of Communication, 20 (1970), 291-304; and Al Rundle, "The Interview Field Trip in Discussion Research," The Speech Teacher, 20 (1971), 70; and Judith A. Runkle, "A Survey of Small Group Activities Used in Beginning Speech Courses," Today's Speech, 22 (1974), 25-30; and Donald C. Shields and Virginia Kidd, "Teaching Through Popular Film: A Small Group Analysis of the Poseidon Adventure," The Speech Teacher, 22 (1973), 201-207.

[46]Shields and Kidd.

[47]Bormann, "Pedagogic Space: A Strategy for Teaching Discussion."